

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-38 are pending in this application. Claims 1-10, 12-21, 23-32, and 34-38 stand substantively rejected. Claims 11, 22, and 33 are objected to as depending from rejected base claims, but are considered to present patentable subject matter. Reconsideration of the rejected claims is respectfully requested. The paragraph numbering below follows that of the Office Action.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102

¶2. Claims 1-10, 12-15, 18-21, 23-30, 32, 34, and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,938,890 to Schlinkman et al. [Schlinkman"]. This rejection is traversed.

According to MPEP 2131, to anticipate a claim, the cited reference must teach every element of the claim. Schlinkman fails to meet this test.

Independent Claim 1

Presently pending independent claim 1 is drawn to a component transfer device that includes, among other things, a roller device for moving a liner, a gripper for gripping the liner, a placement actuator for engaging a component and placing it on a target. The gripper and placement actuator are removably coupled with a coupler that can move the placement actuator when the roller device moves the liner.

Schlinkman describes an apparatus for removing components that are adhesively mounted on a web roll and applying them to items. The apparatus includes a roller (3) for moving a web tape (26), a brake (12) that clamps down on the tape, and a chuck (13) that clamps down on a component (21). Clamping signals can be sent from microprocessor control (32) to brake (12) and chuck (13). As seen in Fig. 1 (with phantom) and Fig. 2, assembly 9 moves between a first position where tape (26) is directly below chuck (13) and a retracted position where tape (26) is not directly below chuck (13).

According to the Office Action, the brake (12) and chuck (13) are coupled through the control (32), and therefore read on the presently claimed gripper and placement actuator that are removably coupled with a coupler. Applicants disagree.

It is respectfully submitted that Schlinkmann's control (32) is not described as *removably coupled* with the brake (12) or the chuck (13). In fact, if either the brake (12) or the chuck (12) were removed from the control (32), the intended operation of Schlinkmann's apparatus would be defeated. Thus, Schlinkmann fails to anticipate presently pending claim 1.

Independent Claim 23

Presently pending independent claim 23 is drawn to a component transfer device that includes, among other things, a placement device that engages a component while the component is adhered to a liner, and a gripper that grips the liner. The gripper and placement device are adapted for moving about a same linear distance when the liner is moved. Advantageously, such a configuration allows movement of the gripper and the placement device while the liner moves.

According to the Office Action, Schlinkmann's controller (32) is adapted for moving the chuck (13) when the roller (3) moves the tape (26). Yet a close inspection of Fig. 1 of Schlinkmann reveals that movement of chuck (13) and brake (12) is limited to perpendicular movement relative to tape (26) movement. There is no teaching that the chuck (13) and brake (12) move about a same linear distance when the tape (26) is moved. In fact, the brake (12) is described as preventing movement of the tape (26). Thus, Schlinkmann fails to anticipate presently pending claim 23.

Independent Claim 27

Presently pending independent claim 27 is drawn to a method of transferring components from a liner to a desired target. The method includes, among other things, engaging the liner with a gripper and with a placement actuator, and moving the liner such that the gripper and the placement actuator move with the liner. As noted above, Schlinkmann describes movement of chuck (13) and brake (12) only perpendicular to movement of tape (26). There is no teaching or suggestion that chuck (13) and brake (12) move with the tape (26). The brake (12) is described as preventing movement of the tape (26). Thus, Schlinkmann fails to anticipate presently pending claim 27.

Claims 2-10, 12-15, and 18-21 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, claims 24-26 depend directly from claim 23, and claims 28-30, 32, 34, and 38 depend directly from

claim 27. Thus, these claims are also allowable as depending from allowable base claims, as well as for the novel combination of elements they recite. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

First Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

¶4. Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly obvious over Schlinkmann as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,009,926 to Viktorius et al. ["Viktorius"]. This rejection is traversed.

According to MPEP 2143, a *prima facie* case of obviousness requires, among other things, that the cited references when combined must teach or suggest all of the claim elements. The combination of Schlinkmann and Viktorius fails to meet this test.

As noted above, Schlinkmann's control (32) is not described as *removably coupled* with the brake (12) or the chuck (13), and thus Schlinkmann fails to anticipate presently pending claim 1. Viktorius discusses a device for attaching adhesive labels to packaged goods, but fails to teach or suggest a device having a gripper and a placement actuator that are removably coupled with a coupler. Therefore, Viktorius fails to remedy the deficiencies of Schlinkmann. Presently pending claim 16 depends directly from claim 1, and is therefore allowable as depending from an allowable base claim as well as for the nonobvious combination of elements it recites. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Second Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

¶5. Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly obvious over Schlinkmann as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,368,446 to McNestry et al. ["McNestry"]. This rejection is traversed.

As noted above, a *prima facie* case of obviousness requires, among other things, that the cited references when combined must teach or suggest all of the claim elements. The combination of Schlinkmann and McNestry fails to meet this test.

Schlinkmann's control (32) is not described as *removably coupled* with the brake (12) or the chuck (13), and thus Schlinkmann fails to anticipate presently pending claim 1. McNestry discusses a device for attaching labels to articles, but fails to teach or suggest a device having a gripper and a placement actuator that are removably coupled with a coupler. Therefore,

McNestry fails to remedy the deficiencies of Schlunkmann. Presently pending claim 17 depends directly from claim 1, and is therefore allowable as depending from an allowable base claim as well as for the nonobvious combination of elements it recites. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Third and Fourth Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

¶¶6,7. Claims 31, 35, 36, and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly obvious over Schlunkmann as applied to claim 27 above, and further in view of McNestry. These rejections are traversed.

A *prima facie* case of obviousness requires, among other things, that the cited references when combined must teach or suggest all of the claim elements. The combination of Schlunkmann and McNestry fails to meet this test.

As noted above, Schlunkmann describes movement of chuck (13) and brake (12) only perpendicular to movement of tape (26). There is no teaching or suggestion that chuck (13) and brake (12) move with the tape (26). Thus, Schlunkmann fails to anticipate presently pending claim 27. McNestry discusses a device for attaching labels to articles, but fails to teach or suggest a method of transferring components from a liner to a target wherein a gripper and a placement actuator move with a liner as presently claimed. Therefore, McNestry fails to remedy the deficiencies of Schlunkmann. Presently pending claims 31, 35, 36, and 37 depend directly or indirectly from claim 27, and are therefore allowable as depending from an allowable base claim as well as for the nonobvious combination of elements they recite. Withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Appl. No. 10/821,722
Amdt. dated March 3, 2006
Reply to Office Action of October 3, 2005

PATENT

Respectfully submitted,



Nathan S. Cassell
Reg. No. 42,396

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
NSC:nsc
60707195 v1